LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.
GIFT OF

Received Feb., 1889
Accessions No. 38178 Shelf No.

MEMORANDA

CONCERNING

EDWARD WHALLEY

AND

WILLIAM GOFFE.

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA.

of the judges of Chas. I, who found refuge in Americ

By Franklin B. Dexter.

[From the Papers of the New Haven Colony Historical Society, Vol. II.]

NEW HAVEN:
TUTTLE, MOREHOUSE & TAYLOR, PRINTERS.
1876.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/memorandaconcern00dextrich

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA.

MEMORANDA

RESPECTING

EDWARD WHALLEY AND WILLIAM GOFFE

By FRANKLIN B. DEXTER.

[Read November 14, 1870.]

Rev. Ezra Stiles, President of Yale College, published at Hartford, in April, 1795, a "History of three of the Judges of King Charles I," which has been supposed to contain all that could ever be known about these worthies. But in 1868 the Massachusetts Historical Society printed in their Collections (4th Series, vol. viii),* a series of manuscripts originally belonging to one of the three Judges, and not used by President Stiles. I would not, if I could, dispel the fascination of Dr. Stiles's book; but the new information† revives a local interest in the regicides, and my object is merely to sketch the personal history of Generals Whalley and Goffe.

The parents of Edward Whalley were Richard Whalley of Kirkton Hall, Nottinghamshire, a country member of Parliament in the last of Elizabeth's reign, and Frances Cromwell,‡ an aunt of the future Protector. The father's losses of property in litigation may have affected the career of the son, who first comes into notice in the civil war. His previous occupation

* In the following pages this volume is sometimes referred to as M. H. C. (4) viii.

† The originals are now a part of the Prince Library, and deposited in the Public Library of the City of Boston: Rev. Thomas Prince obtained them from the Mather family, with other manuscripts, hence called "Mather Papers."

‡ Frances was the second wife of Richard. Their eldest son was Thomas, who died May, 1637, before his father, (leaving a son, Peniston Whalley, who died in 1672, aet. 48.) Edward was their second son, and Henry their third. [Thoroton's Nottinghamshire, 2d ed., i, 249.]

is unknown, though the Royalist pamphlets gossip to the effect that he was "a woollen-draper, or petty merchant, in London; whose shop being out of sorts, and his cash empty, not having wherewithal to satisfy his creditors, he fled into Scotland for refuge, till the wars began." ("Second Narrative of the late Parliament," 1658, in Harleian Miscellany, iii, 482. Cf. "Treason Discovered," 1660.) Sir Philip Warwick, in his Memoirs of the Reign of King Charles I (p. 307), more kindly describes him as "a ridiculous Phanatick, as well as a crack-brained fellow, though he was a Gentleman of a good family, of which sort of men they had very few among them." There is other testimony that he sided with Parliament from religious conviction, and in opposition to the sentiments of some of his nearest relatives. (See "Noble's Memoirs of the House of Cromwell.")

In the midsummer of 1642, "Mr. Oliver Cromwell," a member of Parliament for the town of Cambridge, began to superintend the defence of Cambridgeshire against the insane movements of the king; in August he was Captain of a volunteer troop of horse, and by March, 1643, was Colonel. In the same August, his kinsman, Edward Whalley, was Cornet of the 60th regiment of horse (John Fiennes, Captain), and by March, 1643, was Captain.

The next mention found of his name is in the letters of Cromwell, reporting an indecisive action at Gainsborough, in Lincolnshire, July 28, 1643: "Major Whalley," he writes, "did in this carry himself with all gallantry becoming a gentleman and a Christian" (Carlyle's Cromwell, i, 159); and again, "The honor of this retreat, equal to any of late times, is due to Major Whalley and Captain Ayscough, next under God."

By March, 1645, when the newly modeled army was organized, with Fairfax Commander-in-Chief, Whalley was prominent enough to be made Colonel of one of the eleven cavalry regiments, and as such helped notably to win the day at Naseby.*

* His regiment was in the front line of the Parliamentary right wing, and was the first to become engaged with Sir Marmaduke Langdale's horse opposite to them. See Markham's Life of Fairfax, p. 220, and Rushworth's Collections, vi, 43.

The first Civil War lasted for two years longer, and no regiment was more busy than Colonel Whalley's. We trace him at the defeat of Goring's army at Langport (July 10, 1645), at the sieges of Bridgewater (July 11–25, 1645), of Sherborne Castle (Aug. 1–15, 1645), of Bristol (Aug. 21 to Sept. 11, 1645), of Exeter (Febr., 1646), of Oxford (March, 1646), and of Banbury. On May 9, 1646, the day on which his letter to the Speaker, announcing the storming of Banbury Castle, was written and received, the House voted him their thanks and one hundred pounds for the purchase of two horses. ("Cary's Memorials," i, 28.)

From Banbury he marched to Worcester, where Sir Henry Washington (own cousin to the grandfather of General George Washington) surrendered to him on July 23, after eleven weeks' siege. The city of Oxford had already surrendered to Fairfax, and the first Civil War was at an end.

Meantime, for the two years succeeding the battle of Naseby, Richard Baxter was the chaplain of Whalley's regiment, and in strange contrast to camps and sieges was meditating the peaceful sentences of the "Saint's Everlasting Rest." Years afterward (in 1654) he dedicated one of his works, in appreciative words, to his old Colonel.

The next glimpse of Whalley is in June, 1647, when the king was taken (not unwillingly) by Cornet George Joyce and his five hundred troopers from the custody of Parliament at Holdenby (or Holmby) House, in Northamptonshire, and Whalley was sent by Gen. Fairfax with a strong party to meet Charles and escort him back; but Charles declined to return.

A little later, in the "halcyon days," when the king was lodged in Hampton Court Palace, Whalley was (through Cromwell's influence) for the whole time (Aug. 24 to Nov. 11, 1647) his keeper, and was suspected of connivance in his escape to the Isle of Wight.

In the summer of 1648 came war again, and Whalley went with Fairfax, to quell the Kentish Insurrection, and assist at the capture of Maidstone and the siege of Colchester. In December, he stood by the side of Colonel Pride, while he

purged by force the Long Parliament, so as to secure a vote which should bring the shuffling king to trial.

Accordingly, on the fourth of January, 1649, the Commons voted to create a High Court of Justice for the trying and judging of Charles Stuart, and Whalley was named among the one hundred and thirty-five Commissioners. He was present at all save one of the sessions of that memorable Court, and his firm, clear signature is the fourth (next after President Bradshaw's, Lord Grey's, and Oliver Cromwell's) among the fifty-nine signatures to the final death-warrant. There is no direct testimony as to the convictions under which he acted at this time; but no one can study his subsequent career and extant letters, without the belief that he was then as afterwards thoroughly conscientious, fearing God and not man, perhaps fanatical, but not vindictive, crafty, or self-seeking.

During Lieut. Gen. Cromwell's Irish campaign (July, 1649 to May, 1650) Whalley's regiment apparently remained in England. But in June, 1650, when Cromwell was made Captain-General and Commander-in-Chief, Whalley joined him for Scotland with the rank of Commissary-General. Here Cromwell's dispatches after the victory at Dunbar (Sept. 3, 1650) mark the bravery of his onset, and give in the list of casualties, "Col. Whalley only cut in the hand-wrist, and his horse (twice shot) killed under him; but he well recovered another horse, and went on in the chase" (Carlyle's Cromwell, iii, 52).

In August, 1651, Cromwell following Charles II into England, left Monk and Whalley in command, and Parliament voted to each of them in September an estate in England of the yearly value of five hundred pounds. But before many weeks, Whalley was in London again, and present at a memorable conference when the leaders of the Parliament and of the Army met to consider and arrange the settlement of the nation ("Whitelocke's Memorials").

Parliament goes on from bad to worse, as the Army thinks, and at the next move Whalley's name leads the signatures to a long petition from the officers, dated August 13, 1652, craving and suggesting necessary religious and civil reforms and

arrangements for a successor to the Rump, now in its twelfth year of service. This was the leaven which roused the House to provide for its own dissolution and for a successor; but on the eve of action, General Cromwell took affairs into his own hands, and Whalley stood by his side when he summarily dismissed the Rump, on the 20th of April, 1653.

Cromwell was now openly at the head of the State, though it was not till the 16th of the following December that he was first named Lord Protector. In the scheme of government adopted for the Commonwealth, one feature was to be a triennial Parliament, of five hundred members, guaranteed from dissolution or prorogation for at least five months. In the first Parliament convened under this regulation, Whalley was a representative for Nottinghamshire.

The most important trust which he held, however, was as Major General, when in August, 1655, the command of the militia was divided among ten (afterwards twelve) such officers, who retained office till January, 1657. These Major Generals were clothed with almost absolute authority in their several districts, in special to suppress insurrections, to call to account suspected persons, to levy the ten per cent. income-tax on all royalists; and, in general, to reduce the country to the old foundations of peace and order.

Whalley had charge of his native county, Nottinghamshire, with the adjacent shires of Lincoln, Derby, Warwick, and Leicester. His headquarters were at Nottingham, and twenty-six of his despatches, preserved in Secretary Thurloe's Collection of State Papers (vols. iv and v), tell the story of his wise and faithful administration of the duties laid on him; written only for the eyes of the Lord Protector and his Secretary of State, they bear perpetual testimony to his honesty and uprightness.

His position secured him a reëlection from Nottinghamshire to the next Parliament, whose first session was from Sept. 17, 1656, to June 26, 1657, and whose chief business was the presentation of the "Petition and Advice" to his Highness the Lord Protector, and the offer of the royal title. General

Whalley is mentioned as using his influence in favor of the assumption of kingship. At the close of the year 1657, for a casual glimpse of Whalley's activity, one may look at the diary of the royalist, John Evelyn, who came to London on Christmas Day to attend church service, which was of course a ceremony forbidden by the authorities; he was apprehended while receiving the sacrament, and tells at length the story of his examination before Whalley and a company of officers.

A month later Parliament reassembled, and in accordance with the "Petition and Advice," the "Other House" was constituted by special writ. In this almost anomalous body, of forty-two members, "Edward, Lord Whalley," sat, during its only session, from Jan. 20, to Feb. 4, 1658.

In the following June, he was one of the committee of nine, charged by Cromwell with preparing business for the next meeting of Parliament in September; but before the summons had been issued, death had summoned the busy Lord Protector. From that moment the restoration of the Stuarts was inevitable.

During the eight months' Protectorate which succeeded, Whalley was a main-stay of the Cromwell dynasty; but Richard's abdication came on May 5, 1659, and the Long Parliament on reassembling withdrew Whalley's commission as General, through fear of his influence with the army. In October, when the army tried to seize the power, Whalley was sent as one of their commissioners to treat with his old comrade, Monk; but Monk refused to meet him, and presently the Restoration was accomplished.

But before pursuing his course further, there is another actor to introduce. The public career of William Goffe runs nearly parallel to that of Whalley, his father-in-law and companion in exile. Little is known of his early life. His father, "a very severe Puritan," as Anthony à Wood calls him, was the Rev. Stephen Goffe, a graduate (B. A. 1595, M. A. 1599) of Magdalen College, Oxford, and at one time (before 1607) rector of Bramber, a little village in Sussex. The sharp divisions of the times are manifested in the divergent careers of three sons of this Puritan household. Stephen, the eldest, had his training at Merton College, Oxford (B. A. 1623), was

chaplain of Col. Horace Vere's regiment at the Hague in 1632–3, then by Archbishop Laud's recommendation preacher to the English merchants in Delft, chaplain in Col. Goring's regiment in 1641, afterwards (1645) secret agent of the Royalist cause in France and Holland; turned Papist, became one of Queen Henrietta Maria's chaplains,* and died a priest of the Oratory in Paris, in 1681,† aet. 76.‡

John, another brother, also an Oxford graduate (B. A. 1630), steadily adhered to the Church of England, and was vicar of Hackington, near Canterbury, but ejected in 1643 for his refusal to take the "Solemn League and Covenant." Through his brother William's influence he obtained in 1652 another rectory at Norton, in Kent, where he died in 1661.

A third brother, James, is only known through General Goffe's reference to him in a letter of July, 1656, in Thurloe's Collection.

The remaining brother, William Goffe, utter foe to both Papist and Churchman, was probably at least ten or twelve years younger than Whalley, whose daughter he married. Of his occupation before 1647, no account is preserved, except the comment of the "Second Narrative of the late Parliament," which describes him as "sometime Col. Vaughan's brother's apprentice (a salter in London), whose time being near or newly out, betook himself to be a soldier, instead of setting up his trade; went out a quartermaster of foot, and continued in the wars till he forgot what he fought for; in time became a Colonel, and, in the outward appearance, very zealous and frequent in praying, preaching, and pressing, for righteousness and freedom, and highly esteemed in the army, on that account, when honesty was in fashion."

The earliest mention of his name is in June, 1647, when the Army accused the eleven Parliamentary Members. He next appears as "Major Goffe," exhorting in a meeting of army officers at Windsor Castle about the beginning of 1648. Nor

* Cf. Pepys' diary, Sept. 19, 1666, and Evelyn's correspondence, Aug., 1663.

† See page 181 of the volume of "Mather Papers," M. H. C. (4) viii, for a reference to him in 1662.

‡ Horsfield's History of Lewes and Vicinity, ii, 219.

is his name seen again until we reach the trial of the king. His signature to the death warrant is the fourteenth in order.

In May, 1649, some of the principal Parliamentary officers visited Oxford by invitation; Fairfax and Cromwell were made Doctors of Laws; Goffe and ten others Masters of Arts.

After this date, Goffe's experiences are almost a copy of Whalley's. With him he accompanied Cromwell into Scotland, as Colonel of a regiment of foot, and is mentioned in the official report of the battle of Dunbar. In 1654 he was returned to Parliament from Yarmouth, in Norfolk, and in 1656 from Southampton. Like Whalley, he was made a Major General in 1655, with command in Sussex (his native county), Hampshire, and Berkshire, and headquarters in Winchester. With Whalley he favored the title of King Oliver, sat in the "Other House," was on the commission arranging business for Parliament when Cromwell died; supported to the last the authority of Richard, and was sent by the army to make terms with Monk.

Thirty-three of his letters in Thurloe's Collection (vols. iv and v), written while serving as Major General, give a clear picture of his unaffected piety, honesty, and humility; a single sentence from a letter of Nov. 13, 1655, to Cromwell's Secretary, may illustrate; "If you think fit," he says, "I beseech you present my most humble service to his Highness, for whom I pray without ceasing, and can, I hope, cheerfully sacrifice my life in the service, if need be; but I wish he do not repent the laying so great a trust upon so poor and inconsiderable a creature."

For the esteem in which he was held, one may see a letter from the second Protector, Nov. 15, 1658 (Thurloe, vii, 504), bestowing on him lands in Ireland of the yearly value of five hundred pounds, in such terms as these: "Calling to mind the great worth and merit of our trusty and well-beloved William, Lord Goffe, Major General of the foot in our army, and of his many eminent, constant, and faithful services, and with what singular valor and prudence he hath done and performed the same to these nations in time of the late wars and otherwise; and also being made acquainted with the gracious intentions of

our most dear and entirely beloved father, his late highness of blessed memory, towards the said William, Lord Goffe; and to compensate his desert; we are well pleased to grant," etc.

These outlines show us that both Whalley and Goffe were brave soldiers and trusty leaders, helped into prominence by their relation to Cromwell, and in a measure the creatures of his stronger will. That Goffe at least had independently a marked character may be judged from another passage in the anonymous pamphlet already twice quoted, where it is said, just before Oliver Cromwell's death, General Goffe "hath advanced his interest greatly, and is in so great esteem and favor at court, that he is judged the only fit man to have Major General Lambert's place and command, as major general of the army; and, having so far advanced, is in a fair way to the Protectorship hereafter."

But we pass on a little, and instead of the Protectorship comes exile, only crowned by death.

On May 1, 1660, letters were read in the two Houses from Charles II, containing the famous "Declaration of Breda," dated Apr. 4, which promised pardon to all save "only such persons as shall hereafter be excepted by Parliament."

Whalley and Goffe were wise enough to mistrust all promises from the son of Charles I, and three days later, under the thin disguise of Edward Richardson and William Stephenson, they embarked at Gravesend in the "Prudent Mary," Captain Pierce, master.

On Saturday, May 12, the king was proclaimed at Gravesend, and on Monday their vessel sailed for Boston, where they arrived in ten weeks from the following Friday, or on July 27. Among their fellow-passengers were Major Daniel Gookin, an assistant in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, and Marmaduke Johnson, coming to print the first installment of Eliot's Indian Bible.

Scarcely were they out of sight of England, when, on May 18, the House of Lords ordered the seizure of the members of the Court which condemned Charles I. Just a week later, the king landed at Dover, and on June 6 issued his proclamation, summoning a long list of persons (Whalley and Goffe included) to appear within a fortnight, or forfeit pardon.

From the day of leaving Westminster until 1667, the younger of the two exiles kept a journal, to which Governor Hutchinson, a hundred years later, had access while writing his History of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay; this diary then belonged to the Mather family, but was destroyed in the attack on Hutchinson's house by the mob, in 1765; a contemporaneous transcript of a few extracts, extending, however, only from May 4 to Sept. 6, 1660, found among the Winthrop family papers, was printed in the Proceedings of the Mass. Historical Society, for Dec., 1863.

On the landing of the two Judges in Boston, they accepted the hospitality of their fellow-passenger, Major Gookin, and remained openly at his house in Cambridge for seven months. The copy of Goffe's diary just mentioned preserves the form of thanksgiving handed by them to "Matchless" Mitchell, the minister of Cambridge, on the first day of public worship after their arrival.

On August 29, Parliament passed the Act of Indemnity, from the benefits of which Whalley and Goffe were excepted by name; on Sept. 22, a rumor having arisen that they had "lately returned" to England, a special Royal Proclamation* offered rewards for their apprehension,—alive or dead, anywhere within the king's dominions,—of one hundred pounds each.

News of the Act of Indemnity did not reach New England until the last day of November; soon followed by the report of the trial, beginning October 10, of twenty-nine persons for connection with the death of the late king. When it was remembered that Captain Thomas Breedon, a prominent Royalist of Boston, had sailed for England, and was sure to announce that he had seen Generals Whalley and Goffe, no wonder that some of the government began to desire to be rid of their dangerous guests, and that on Febr. 22, 1661, Governor Endicott summoned his council of Assistants (of whom their host, Gookin, was one) to consult about securing them. The Assistants did not agree to any measures, but the regicides removed the cause of apprehension by leaving four days afterwards for New Haven. And why for New Haven?

* A copy may be seen in the British Museum.

A fortnight after their landing in New England, the Rev. John Davenport, of New Haven, in a letter to Governor Winthrop of Connecticut (in Mass. Historical Collections, 3d Series, v. x, p. 39), had mentioned their being in Boston, and his intention of inviting them to visit him. It is not likely that he had ever met either of them; the only known connection between him and the Goffe family was in 1633, when General Goffe's brother Stephen was Archbishop Laud's spy on the movements of Davenport, in exile at the Hague. (Calendar of Domestic State Papers for 1633–34, p. 324.) But the Rev. William Hooke, whose wife was sister of Whalley, had been Davenport's associate in the ministry of the First Church of New Haven from 1644 to 1656, and since then his regular correspondent. William Jones, also, who had just joined the settlement here, and became its leading civilian, was a passenger in the ship with the regicides. Other remoter links of connection between the Protector's Government and the Colony of New Haven were through Samuel Desborough, Lord Keeper of Scotland, who lived in New Haven and Guilford from 1639 to 1650, and whose brother, General John Desborough, married a sister of Cromwell and cousin of Whalley; and through the Rev. Henry Whitfield, of Guilford, in this Colony, from 1639 to 1650, in whose family at Winchester Goffe had lived, while at the height of his power as Major General over three shires of England, in 1656.

On their journey of some 140 miles, the travelers passed through Hartford and were entertained by Governor Winthrop. It may be, also, that one of their halting-places was near the ford of the large brook in the present township of Meriden, twenty miles from New Haven, called Pilgrims' Harbor Brook to this day.

In nine days from Cambridge, they reached New Haven, on Thursday, March 7, 1661, and appeared openly as Mr. Davenport's guests for the next three weeks. While they were on the road, however, there had come to Boston, by way of Barbados, rumors of a Royal Proclamation for their arrest, given at London in January, on information supplied by Captain Breedon. Accordingly, the Governor and Assistants of Mas-

sachusetts, now that their vigilance could do no harm, cheerfully issued, on March 8, a warrant to secure them, and sent it through that Colony. The news of the King's Proclamation coming to New Haven, and threatening a possible risk to their hosts here, the Judges, on March 27, went to Milford and allowed themselves to be seen there, as though proceeding to New York, but the same night they returned and lay concealed at Mr. Davenport's until May.

On April 28, another royal mandate reached Boston, dated March 5, caused by further accounts of the residence of Whalley and Goffe in Cambridge, and ordering their arrest; but directed by some strange blunder to an official as yet unheard-of, "the Governor of New England." Governor Endicott hesitated for a week (during which time the news was of course sent hither), and then without summoning his Council committed the warrant to two young men, with letters from himself to the Chief Magistrates of Plymouth, Connecticut, New Haven, and New York. (The letter to Dep. Gov. Leete of New Haven is in "Documents relating to Colonial History of N. Y.," iii, 41.)

On Tuesday, May 7, about 6 P. M., the two Commissioners, Thomas Kellond, merchant, and Thomas Kirk, shipmaster, with John Chapin as guide, left Boston for Connecticut. On Friday they called on Governor Winthrop at Hartford, who told them that Whalley and Goffe "did not stay there, but went directly for New Haven." (Report of the Commissioners, in Hutchinson's Collections.) He promised, however, a search in his jurisdiction, which their Report says was made.*

The next day (Saturday, May 11) they came to Guilford, where lived Deputy-Governor Leete, who since the death of Governor Newman, in November, 1660, had been the Chief Magistrate of the Colony of New Haven. Leete received them in the presence of several persons, and began to read their letters aloud; on their objecting to such publicity, he withdrew to another room and assured them (probably with truth) that he had not seen the "Colonels," as Whalley and Goffe were

* The warrant for a search in Windsor may be seen in N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Register for 1868, xxii, 345.

called, for nine weeks, that is, since their first arrival in the Colony. The Commissioners replied that they had information of the Colonels being in New Haven since, and demanded horses, about which there was some delay. On their way to the inn, they were told by one Dennis Crampton (Scranton, in their Report), who called other witnesses to the facts, that the regicides were sheltered by Davenport, and that Leete undoubtedly knew it; that Mr. Davenport had recently put in ten pounds' worth of fresh provisions at one time; that Whalley and Goffe on a late training-day (probably in Milford) had openly said that if they had but two hundred friends to stand by them, they would not care for Old or New England. Other bystanders reported that they had very lately been seen between the houses of Mr. Davenport and Mr. Jones.

Excited by this gossip, the Commissioners returned to Leete to demand their horses, military aid, and a warrant to search and arrest. But apparently it was towards sundown, and a Deputy Governor would demur to any traveling within his control until the approaching Sabbath was over. As to a search-warrant and a *posse*, he must consult his brother-magistrates before seeming to recognize such an unprecedented authority as the "Governor of New England," to whom their commission was directed. He would give them, however, a letter to the magistrate residing in New Haven. Meantime they were obliged to wait, chafing with the suspicion that a Guilford Indian had already carried forwards the news of their arrival.

At daybreak on Monday they were allowed to depart, but not before another messenger had preceded them from Leete to Matthew Gilbert, the New Haven magistrate; so that when they arrive the magistrate is nowhere to be seen. Leete had promised to follow them, and there was nothing to be done but wait for his slower-moving dignity. Two hours later he appeared at the court chamber, with Magistrate Crane of Branford, and told the Commissioners that he did not believe that Whalley and Goffe *were* in New Haven (the fact being that they had removed on Saturday night from Mr. Jones's house to "the Mills" in Westville). They offered, if he would allow

it, to search the two suspected houses on their own responsibility: but he replied that he neither would nor could do anything until the freemen were met together. Meantime, the other magistrates and the deputies of New Haven had come in, and Leete spent five or six hours in consultation, only to make the same answer. To the Commissioners' threats of his Majesty's probable resentment, Leete replied, "we honor his Majesty, but we have tender consciences." To which the Commissioners testily retorted that they believed the magistrates knew all the time where the Colonels were, "and only pretended tenderness of conscience for a refusal." Again the magistrates deliberated, but evening found them still unyielding, and when the Commissioners pressed the question "whether they would own his Majesty or no, it was answered they would first know whether his Majesty would own them," that is, whether their government would be recognized as independent of a Governor of all New-England, now for the first time dimly threatened.

Baffled and powerless, the Commissioners left on the following day for New York, and returned to Boston by sea, where as a small recompense for their pains the Governor's Council granted them each two hundred and fifty acres of land.

The Colonels must remain hidden, at least until the present alarm is over; and accordingly, on the day after the king's messengers had gone westwards, a cave on West Rock (which they called Providence Hill) received them; there they spent four weeks, sheltered in stormy weather in the house of the only neighbor, Richard Sperry, who also supplied them with food. The traditions recited by Dr. Stiles (pp. 31, 78) of a visit of the Royal Commissioners to this cave are utterly irreconcilable with their narrative.

At the conference on Monday, the magistrates had decided to convene the General Court, which accordingly met at New Haven the following Friday, and by its command orders were issued to the marshals in each plantation to search diligently for the Colonels. One of these warrants is given in the printed volume of Colonial Records. Nevertheless, the Judges' Cave

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

was not invaded. From this miserable shelter, only the rumor of harm threatening Mr. Davenport through the suspicion of his still concealing them, induced them to emerge. On June 11, says Gov. Hutchinson, they leave West Rock, "generously resolving to go to New Haven, and deliver themselves to the authority there;" namely, to Gilbert, who had been made Deputy-Governor at an election just held.

There is some uncertainty as to the place where they passed the next ten days, since it was not till the 22d that they appeared in New Haven.

President Stiles supposed that they spent a part or the whole of this time, from the 11th to the 22d of June, in Guilford, in Governor Leete's stone cellar, and in Dr. Rossiter's house; but his arguments are not conclusive.

There was, it is true, a tradition that the Judges were at some time hid in Guilford, for three days and three nights (Stiles, p. 92), but there is no special reason for determining this to be the time.

The mention in the Colony Records (May 7, 1662) in the case of Dr. Rossiter, of Guilford (then on trial for refusal to pay certain rates and assessments, and for denying the authority of the colony), of his "charges about the Colonels," cannot refer, as Dr. Stiles supposed, to his bill for shelter given to them while visiting Guilford in June, 1661; the prudence of the General Court, as well as the pronounced sympathies of Rossiter with royal authority, forbid the absurd supposition that the Colonels had been entertained at the public expense. Rossiter's charges were probably for aiding in the search made in Guilford after the order of the Court on May 17.

Dr. Stiles relies, also, on the second-hand testimony of Gov. Leete's daughter Ann, who is said to have remembered a time when she and the rest of the children of the family were forbidden to go to a certain old stone cellar, for which prohibition the hiding of the Colonels was afterwards avowed as the reason; Dr. Stiles supposed her to have been four or five years old in 1661, but in fact the register of Guilford births shows that this daughter of Gov. Leete was not born until March, 1662.

The Rev. John Davenport (in a letter written in August, to be again referred to) says that on June 22, Whalley and Goffe "came from another colony, where they were and had been some time, to New Haven." The authority for their leaving West Rock on June 11 is Goffe's diary, as used by Hutchinson. It is hardly probable that between the two dates they made a journey into either of the bordering colonies, where their stay must at best have been short; but on the other hand it is inconceivable that the cave "where they were and had been sometime" was unknown to their chief friend. Mr. Davenport's statement looks like a prevarication.

On Saturday, June 22, then, they appeared in New Haven, "professing," writes Davenport, "that their true intention, in their coming at that time, was to yield themselves to be apprehended," but the Deputy-Governor took no measures for their arrest. "The next day," says Hutchinson, "some persons came to them to advise them not to surrender." On the day following, the magistrates met at New Haven on other business, but through either connivance or over-confidence deferred taking custody of their uncaged prisoners. Before the magistrates' meeting was ended, the Colonels had disappeared; or, to give the account in Davenport's words, "Our Governor and magistrates wanted neither will nor industry to have served his Majesty in apprehending the two Colonels, but were prevented and hindered by God's overruling providence, which withheld them that they could not execute their true purpose therein; and the same Providence could have done the same, in the same circumstances, if they had been in London, or in the Tower. Before the magistrates issued their consultation, which was not long, the Colonels were gone away, no man knowing how nor whither. Thereupon a diligent search was renewed, and many were sent forth on foot and horseback. * * * But all in vain."

Mr. Davenport seems to imply that they escaped by miraculous means, "no man knowing how;" perhaps he believed that; perhaps he was wilfully misled.

Rumors of this marvellous eluding of the magistrates soon reached the authorities of Massachusetts Bay, whose agent in

England had already alarmed them by reports that the Council for Plantations were noting the slowness of the Colonies to proclaim Charles II, and would be ready to take offence at the action of New Haven on the royal mandate concerning Whalley and Goffe. Accordingly, in July, Secretary Rawson wrote from Boston, by order of the Council, to Governor Leete, advising him to arrest the regicides at once without any more evasion. (See the letter in Hutchinson's Collections; New Haven Colonial Records, ii, 419; and Stiles, p. 56.) The Governor took the alarm and called together the General Court again, on August 1, to dictate an answer; the answer (in N. H. Colonial Records, ii, 420; and Stiles, p. 49) excused the treatment of the Commissioners in May by blaming their forwardness, "retarding their own business to wait upon ours without commission," as well as by reiterating conscientious objections to "owning a general Governor, unto whom the warrant was directed." The answer also laid the blame of the Colonels' second disappearance on Deputy-Governor Gilbert's remissness, and was strong in declarations of honesty.

This letter was sent on to England, and with it a copy of the letter already cited, from the Rev. John Davenport to Col. Temple of Boston, the trusty agent of Charles II, giving a defence of the writer's conduct in this affair, in terms of unstinted flattery and unquestioned dissimulation. (See the copy of this letter in Mass. Hist. Collections, 3d Series, viii, 327.) It is humiliating that his record of magnanimous fidelity and courage in harboring the friendless exiles, is tarnished by the fawning, disingenuous apology which his own pen has traced.

In communicating these letters, Col. Temple mentions that he has himself joined in a secret design with Mr. John Pynchon, of Springfield, and Capt. Richard Lord, of Hartford, and has great hopes of seizing Whalley and Goffe. Lord died in a few months, and nothing came of the scheme, but on August 19, after the judges had tried cave-life for a brief three months, "the search for them being pretty well over, they ventured to the house of one Tomkins in Milford, where they remained two years, without so much as going into the orchard." (Hutchinson.)

A few weeks later (Sept. 5, 1661), the Commissioners of the United Colonies of New England, in their annual session, held at Plymouth,* issued a warning to all persons in the colonies, not to shelter Whalley and Goffe, but to make their hiding-place known to the magistrates, in pursuance of the king's mandate. Leete signed this order, as one of the Commissioners from the Colony of New Haven; but the signature of his fellow-Commissioner, Benjamin Fenn, of Milford, was withheld, he having accepted office on the last election-day with the express stipulation that "in case any business from without should present, he conceived that he should give no offence if he did not attend to it." Whether his scruples were broader than this special case, or whether the knowledge that the persons in question lodged with one of his nearest neighbors restrained him, may be doubted.

On his return, probably, from this meeting, Gov. Leete stopped in Boston to secure an intercessory letter in his own behalf from the Rev. John Norton to Richard Baxter (dated Sept. 23), which set forth that he "being conscious of indiscretion and some neglect . . . in relation to the expediting the execution of the warrant . . sent from his Majesty for the apprehending of the two Colonels, is not without fear of some displeasure that may follow thereupon;" consequently, he has since done all that he could, as his neighbors also attest. This letter with some preceding circumstances implies that at least a difference of opinion had arisen between Leete on the one hand and Davenport and Gilbert on the other, as to the course of conduct to be pursued in regard to the regicides. The following extracts confirm this view: Rev. William Hooke says in a letter to Davenport, dated Oct. 12 (copied by Goffe in his Milford retreat, and printed in Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., (4) viii, 177), "I understand by your letter [of August] what you have lately met with from Mr. L.;" and in a letter dated Febr. 12, 1662, to Mr. Gilbert, Robert Newman, one of the original pillars of the First Church of New Haven, but some years since returned to England, says, "I am sorry to see that you should

* It is to this meeting that Gov. Bradstreet refers in his letter to Edward Randolph, Dec., 1684, (Mass. Hist. Soc. Collections, 4th Series, viii, 533.)

be so much surprised with fears of what men can or may do unto you - - I hear of no danger, nor do I think any will attend you for that matter. Had not W. L. wrote such a pitiful letter over, the business I think would have died. What it may do to him I know not: they have greater matters than that to exercise their thoughts." (Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll. (4), viii, 182.)

After 1661 the most that is known of Whalley and Goffe is to be gathered from the volume of Mass. Historical Society Collections already referred to, which contains a selection from the letters received by Goffe from 1662 to 1679, draughts of his replies, his letters to Increase Mather, and his minutes of news gleaned from despatches sent him by friends in New England, especially by Davenport and Gilbert of New Haven, and by Waitstill Winthrop, son of the Governor of Connecticut.

This material arranged chronologically will be our chief guide in what follows.

First, however, should be mentioned the letter which Gov. Hutchinson printed in volume I, of his History, being the earliest which has been preserved from Mrs. Goffe to her husband. It was written between August and October, 1662, from the house of her aunt, Mrs. Hooke, and *in propria persona*, that is, as from wife to husband, while all her later letters are worded as if from mother to son.

The year 1663 was marked by a letter from the Rev. Mr. Hooke (begun Febr. 25, and ended March 2), which though directed to Davenport was meant for Goffe also: it was intercepted by the treachery of a messenger and inspected by the Government. "The Secretary said it was as pernicious a letter against the Government as had been written since his Majesty came in." An abstract of it is given in the "Calendar of Domestic State Papers" for 1663–4 (p. 63): it was unsigned, and the writer undetected, though a great stir was made about it. A second letter from Hooke (dated June 24, 1663), rehearsing the matter, is in the volume of Collections* (p. 122).

* This letter, also to Davenport, is erroneously supposed by the editors of the Collections to have been addressed to Goffe.

In 1664 the Judges began to breathe more freely, but towards the end of July four Royal Commissioners arrived in Boston, instructed to visit the New England Colonies and New York, and among other things to inquire after persons attainted of high treason. This pointed directly to Whalley and Goffe, and as soon as they learned of it, they "retired to their cave, where they tarried eight or ten days," when "some Indians, in their hunting, discovered the cave with the bed, etc., and the report being spread abroad, it was not safe to remain near it." (Hutchinson.)

After this, possibly they again sought aslyum with friends in New Haven, possibly in Guilford; but on October 13 (while the Royal Commissioners were at New York) the Rev. John Russell, of Hadley, Mass., having previously agreed to receive them,* they left for that town, seventy-five miles distant, making the journey by night. Dr. Stiles (p. 96) finds a trace of this journey in the name "Pilgrims' Harbor" in Meriden, and such is now the tradition there; but one deed at least is on record, dated Oct. 15, 1664, not many hours after they were passing the spot, in which the name Pilgrim Harbor Brook, or River, is already employed as a familiar boundary. ("Perkins' Sketches of Meriden," p. 104.)

After their arrival in Hadley, the notices of their life are scanty enough. For the year 1665 we have nothing but a transcript by Goffe (M. H. C. (4) viii, p. 126) of part of a letter from Mr. Davenport to William Goodwin, of Hadley, commenting on English news, with one sentence which Goffe copies in cipher, namely, "It would exceedingly refresh me, if I could speak freely and fully with those three worthies your neighbors." The three worthies were Whalley, Goffe, and John Dixwell; the last regicide having joined the others on Febr. 10, 1665 (as Hutchinson learned from the Diary), and continued "some years." He is then lost sight of till he settles in New Haven in 1673. From Davenport's reference to him

* Probably through Davenport's introduction: note also that Wm. Goodwin, Davenport's co-trustee of the Hopkins fund, has lately moved to Hadley, and is party to the secret.

at this early date, it is most probable that he also had already shared the hospitalities of the friends of the Commonwealth here. There is no other reference to him in any of Goffe's papers.

The year 1666 is marked only by Hutchinson's statement that they were disappointed when it passed without any of the startling events which they had expected from a study of the number of the beast in the Apocalypse.

The next four years have only scattered notices, of little interest. Meantime Davenport left New Haven for Boston, and after a brief ministry died there in 1670.

In 1671 there is one letter (M. H. C. (4) viii, p. 133) from Mrs. Goffe, over her assumed signature of Frances Goldsmith, in answer to her husband's (of Aug. 10), and referring to Whalley in terms indicating his already enfeebled condition.

For 1672 the record is much more full, five letters giving a tolerably clear picture of the exiles and their friends at home. (M. H. C., 3d Series, i, 60; Hutchinson's Collections, 432; M. H. C. (4), viii, 136–143, 260, 143.)

One event of the year was the gift of fifty pounds from Mr. Richard Saltonstall, Jr., of Ipswich, to the Judges, on his leaving for England. The letter from his agent (Deacon Edward Collins, of Charlestown, June 1, 1672), cautiously directed to "the Hon^{d} Gentlemen, at their Lodgings wheresoever," is preserved (M. H. C. (4), viii, 134), with the draft of a reply, giving order for payment to Mr. Russell "or such person or persons as he shall appoint." Referring to this gift in the next letter to his wife, Goffe says, "The Lord is pleased to send in supplies for the carrying on of a little trade here among the Indians; as the present stock in New England money (between my partner and myself) is somewhat above one hundred pounds, all debts paid, therefore pray speak to Mrs. Janes" [that is, Whalley's sister, Mrs. Jane Hooke] "not to send any more till she be desired from hence."

Of their life in 1673 we have no glimpse, except in a mutilated draft of a letter from Goffe to Mrs. Hooke (October 2), among the unprinted papers, now in the Prince Collection, in the Boston Public Library.

For 1674 we have a letter from Mr. Hooke (April 4; M. H. C. (4), viii, 148), Goffe's reply (Aug. 5, p. 151), and a letter to his wife (Aug. 6, in Hutchinson's Collections, p. 453). In writing to Hooke, Goffe says of Whalley, "I do not apprehend the near approach of his death more now (save only he is so much older) than I did two years ago. He is indeed very weak; but He that raiseth the dead, is able to restore him to some degree of strength again, and will do it if it may make for His glory, the edification of His people, and our best good." In the same letter the editors of the volume insert a reference to Dixwell, which needs correction. Mr. Hooke's letter (to which this was a reply) had said, speaking of his family, "Our children are all living, if he in New England be so, from whom we have not heard these several years by letters from him, which is a grief to us." This son is also heard of through a letter from his father to Governor Winthrop, of Connecticut, June 30, 1663 (M. H. C. (4), vii, 594), despatching him, then aged 20, to live with the governor as his servant for four years. What end poor Ebenezer Hooke may have made, no one can tell, but Goffe in his reply says, "I am so far off the seaside, that I seldom hear anything of your friend there. I am very sorry he neglects to write to you. There is a friend now gone to those parts whom I have desired to inquire after him. I should be glad to have something to write of him that might be a comfort to you." This certainly has no reference to Dixwell, who was now of New Haven, but does mean Hooke's son; but if New Haven is the "seaside" town referred to, this extract shows conclusively that Goffe and Dixwell had not then any specially intimate relations.

We come to the year 1675, when tradition gives a famous glimpse of the hermit once more turned soldier. Gov. Hutchinson's History records the anecdote as preserved in the family of Gov. Leverett, who had been a Captain in the Parliamentary army early in the Civil War, and had visited the regicides while in Hadley, as Hutchinson learned from the fragment of Goffe's diary in his hands.

It was Wednesday, Sept. 1, and Hadley folk were keeping a

fast with public worship. Suddenly there came an Indian attack, and the townspeople were rallied to victory by a venerable leader, of military bearing, whom none had ever seen before, or ever saw again. Probably the most never knew who their helper was, though the shrewder ones may have guessed and whispered his name. The local traditions which Dr. Stiles (pp. 109–110) and Mr. Judd, the historian of Hadley (pp. 145–147), were able to gather, add no sure details to the romantic outline; but more than one famous novelist has expanded the story in his fiction. It is enough to instance Scott's "Peveril of the Peak" (v. i, ch. 14), and Cooper's "Wept of Wish-ton-wish."

I venture to suggest that a contemporary hint at the occurence may be found in a letter from the Rev. John Russell to Increase Mather (M. H. C. (4) viii, 81), who as we shall see later was a trusted friend of the regicides. Mr. Russell comments thus on Mather's "History of the Indian Wars," in which the attack on Hadley was briefly mentioned without reference to the mysterious leader: "I find nothing considerable mistaken in your history; nor do I know whether you proceed in your intended second edition. That which I most fear in the matter is, lest Mr. B. or some of Connecticut should clash with ours, and contradict each other in the story as to matter of fact. Should that appear in print which I have often heard in words, I fear the event would be exceeding sad." Viewed in the light of subsequent facts, these sentences mean that Goffe had, before the date of this letter (April 18, 1677), removed to Connecticut, and Mr. Russell is apprehensive lest "Mr. B." or others with whom Goffe was now living should contradict any printed version of the dramatic appearance at Hadley, and lest in any event the safety of the poor hunted regicide should be endangered. [See *infra*, p. ~~146.~~ 32]

But before taking up the subject of Goffe's removal from Hadley, the death of Whalley should be referred to. There is now no reason whatever to doubt that Whalley's death occurred in Hadley between August, 1674, and August, 1676. That a regicide died and was buried in Hadley, was the common tra-

dition there when Dr. Stiles made his inquiries (Stiles, p. 198); and sufficient proof of the tradition was found shortly after (in 1795), when the wall of the cellar under Mr. Russell's kitchen was removed. "In taking down the middle part of the front wall" [of the kitchen, to which part alone of the Russell house there was a cellar], "next to the main street, the workmen discovered about four feet below the top of the ground a place where the earth was loose, and a little search disclosed flat stones, a man's bones, and bits of wood. Almost all the bones were in pieces, but one thigh bone was whole, and there were two sound teeth. Dr. S. H. Rogers, who then resided in Hadley, examined the thigh bone, and said it was the thigh bone of a man of large size. . . . No other graves were found behind the cellar wall" ("Judd's Hist. of Hadley," p. 222.)

There is no good reason for doubt that these bones were the mortal remains of General Edward Whalley; nor can one doubt that if President Stiles had lived to hear of the discovery,* he would have been the first to abandon the tradition perpetuated by his credulity, that the stones on the New Haven green marked "E. W." were erected over Whalley's dust. The reader of Dr. Stiles may trace how his theory grew in his own mind, and how the process by which one regicide's grave became three evolved itself as regularly as the story of the three black crows. But Edward Wigglesworth died in New Haven on the first of October, 1653: why should not the stones marked "E. W., 1653," be his memorial? I acknowledge that the "3" is more like an 8; but nobody except Dr. Stiles ever suspected that the "5" was a 7. And yet even though the figures could be supposed to be 1678, that does not fit the present knowledge of the regicide history; for it is certain from Goffe's letters in the volume of Mass. Hist. Collections that Whalley died in 1674, 1675, or 1676.

This will appear from the chronological order of events to which we now return. On March 30, 1676, Edward Randolph

* President Stiles died May 12, 1795, less than a month after the first bound copy of his "History of the Regicides" came from the printer. The curious fact may be noticed that by a misprint the dedication is made to bear date, Nov. 20, 1793; this should be 1794, as Dr. Stiles's MS. diary proves.

left England for Boston, to convey the king's demand for Colonial agents at Court, and to make minute inquiries into the state of the colonies. He was in New England from June 10 to July 30, and in his report (dated in September) says of a law in Massachusetts Bay, encouraging the succor of fugitives: "by which law Whalley and Goffe and other traitors were kindly received and entertained." ("Hutchinson's Collections," p. 483.) Undoubtedly his inquiries were noticed by Goffe's friends, and may have rendered a change of hiding-place expedient.

On page 156 of the volume of Mass. Hist. Collections, is printed an unsigned letter, directed to Increase Mather, sealed with Whalley's seal, and dated "Ebenezer," Sept. 8, 1676. The handwriting of the original is Goffe's, and in it he says, "I was greatly beholden to Mr. Noell for his assistance in my remove to this town. I pray if he be yet in Boston, remember my affectionate respects to him." The only "Mr. Noell" who can be intended is Samuel Nowell of Charlestown, who was a Chaplain in the Connecticut Valley during Philip's War, and was just now starting on a visit to England. The writer of the letter says clearly that through Mr. Nowell's help, he had lately changed his place of residence. The opening sentence of the letter shows the neighborhood from which it was written. "I have read," says Goffe, "the letters from England that you enclosed to Mr. Whiting, and give you hearty thanks for your continued care in that matter:" which can only refer to the Rev. John Whiting, pastor in Hartford from 1660 to 1689. Goffe, apparently, was not under the Hartford minister's roof, but within his reach and securely hidden, for he goes on to say: "I find it very difficult to attain any solid intelligence of what is done abroad. But the works of the Lord are great, and should be sought out of all them that have pleasure therein. I cannot choose therefore but be shutting one eye and peeping with the other through the crevices of my close cell to discern the signs of my Lord's coming."

A few days later (Sept. 25) Mr. Samuel Nowell writes a letter which is also preserved among the "Mather Papers"

(p. 572). The outside address is to "his worthy friend, Mr. Jonathan Bull, of Hartford," but the letter is for Goffe. It begins: "Honored Sir,—The day before the arrival of the bearer, Mr. Bull, I had written a letter to my worthy friend, Mr. Whiting, and it was for your sake, seeing I did not know how to direct a few lines to you." The letter goes on to give the foreign news, and adds: "As for ourselves in New England, we are fearing a General Governor. . . . I suppose you will judge it convenient to remove if any such thing should happen as that a Governor should be sent." At the end the writer promises to send further news from England, and to visit there the relatives of the person he is addressing. The General Governor whom New England feared did not come till 1686, in the person of Sir Edmund Andros. As to Goffe's relatives in England, a chance remark in a subsequent letter of Mrs. Hooke to Increase Mather (June 27, 1678; M. H. C. (4) viii, 262) implies that she had had the proposed visit from Mr. Nowell.

Jonathan Bull, by whom this letter was carried, was a son of Thomas Bull of Hartford, now twenty-seven years old and living unmarried at his father's house, where it is most likely that Goffe was then secreted; the fact that the son married a few years later a daughter of the Rev. John Whiting may emphasize the intimacy between the two families.

Passing on to 1677, we find only an unsigned letter from Goffe to Increase Mather (M. H. C. (4), viii. 159), covering one for England. Two more such letters of 1678 follow (pp. 160, 162), each signed "T. D.";* in the latter of these, dated Oct. 23, he writes, "I should take it as a great kindness to receive a word or two from you; if you please to inclose it to Mr. Whiting, only with this short direction—These for Mr. T. D.—I hope it would come safely."

* Among the Mather papers in the Boston Public Library, but not printed, is one (vol. i, p. 63) containing a report of the king's address, May 28, 1677, in Goffe's hand, written on the reverse of an envelope-side, which has the direction [in Peter Tilton's hand?] (erased, but visible) "These for Capt. Thomas Bull [to] be conveyed to Mr. Duffell, Mercht." Hence I conclude that "T. D." may have been T. Duffell. Mrs. Goffe had relatives of that name in England, but there is no other trace of it in New England during the first century.

Under date of April 2, 1679, is the last of Goffe's letters thus preserved. Gov. Hutchinson also mentions this as the latest seen by him. It is to Increase Mather, and is signed "T. D."

There is one later letter in the collection (p. 224), dated July 30, 1679, addressed to "T. D." (that is, to Goffe), and signed "P. T." No doubt these initials are Peter Tilton's, a prominent man in Hadley, and according to tradition one who sheltered the exiles while concealed in that town. The letter says, "I have sent you by S. P." [Samuel Porter?] "£10., having not before a safe hand to convey it, it being a token of the love and remembrance of several friends who have you upon their hearts. We have lately only that great news of the king's threefold dream, with which his thoughts were sore troubled and amazed, etc., which I presume Mr. Russell hath given you a full account of, as understanding he hath written to Hartford. . . . Dear Sir, I hope God is making way for your enlargement."

Here is then the plain statement that Goffe was living in Hartford in June, 1679, but neither date nor place later in his history can be found. I can hardly doubt that he died very soon after, and was buried by friendly hands in Hartford, and his private papers sent to Increase Mather.

But Dr. Stiles found an ancient stone in our burial ground, marked "M. G. 80," which his ingenious brain led him to fancy was "W. G. 80" (that is, William Goffe, died 1680), betrayed by the stone-cutter's device in underlining the M. I quote Dr. Stiles's words (p. 133) as to the origin of this theory, and they are all-important: "I have not found," he says, "the least tradition or surmise of Goffe [being buried here] till I myself conjectured it, Jan., 1793, inferring it in my own mind without a doubt, that IF Whalley, who certainly died at Hadley, was afterward removed here, Goffe would have been also." But when the undisturbed grave of Whalley was found in Mr. Russell's cellar at Hadley, the entire foundation for Dr. Stiles's theory crumbled by his own explanation.

And, again, that was a very pretty sentiment, worked up by President Stiles, of the three intimate friends, Whalley, Goffe,

and Dixwell, bound by so many experiences in life and unable to rest quietly if separated in their graves. I am sorry to spoil the picture; but these papers of Goffe go far to show that he had no correspondence or intercourse with or interest in Dixwell after his temporary stay in Hadley. If, then, Goffe's bones were moved at all (a theory which the mere difficulties of transportation were enough to overthrow), we must look to Hadley, where his kinsman Whalley lay, and not to New Haven where Dixwell was impatiently lingering in hopes of a return to England. Nor, even if Goffe came to New Haven after leaving Hartford, and here died, does it seem to me possible that any friends, burying the old man who had lived in such utter secresy, would have ventured to put over his grave a falsely-initialed stone, corresponding to no entry in the town record of deaths, but challenging the notice of all the gossips. The confidants of Goffe's secret elsewhere, so far as we know them, Russell, Tilton, Whiting, the Bulls, Saltonstall, Nowell, Mather, kept it so sacredly that Dr. Stiles did not glean a single fact through any gossip handed down from them. We know, on the other hand, that Ex-Governor Matthew Gilbert died here in 1680 (will dated Jan. 14, and inventory July 6), that no one is more likely than he to have been buried in such an honored central place (so near the graves of Governosr Eaton and Jones) and that no other stone in the old cemetery was ever shown as his. Fortunately the circumstantial evidence is strong enough to clear Goffe from the supposition of having been a party, dead or living, to a performance so utterly at variance with his simple, humble, unassuming character.

There is still another episode in respect to his residence in Hartford which needs to be rehearsed. On April 20, 1680, an adventurer named John London, who claimed to have known Goffe in England, made oath before the New York authorities, that in the preceding May (that is about the date of Goffe's last letter), being then a resident of Windsor, Conn., he saw Goffe at the house of Capt. [Joseph, says the record; probably a clerical error for Thomas] Bull in Hartford, living there under the name of Cooke, and that Capt. Bull "hath for

several years past kept privately Col. Goffe, at his own house or his son's." London's affidavit set forth that he took measures to kidnap Goffe, but was betrayed by a neighbor (Thomas Powell) to two of the Hartford magistrates (Maj. Talcott and Capt. Alling), who had him arrested, on charge of conspiracy against the colony.

On May 18, nearly a month after this deposition, Gov. Andros of New York, wrote to the Governor (Wm. Leete) and assistants of Connecticut, giving the substance of the charges, (Conn. Colon. Records for 1678–89, p. 283), and it was not till June 10 that the Secretary of Connecticut issued a search-warrant (Colon. Records, p. 284) to the Hartford constables, to make diligent search in all the premises of Capt. Bull and of his sons, and also "in all places within your limits, where there may be any (or the least) suspicion that they may be hid." The search was vain, and on the next day the Governor and assistants write (Colony Records, p. 285) to Gov. Andros, avowing amazement at the suspicion, and praying to know the names of the informers. Nothing more seems to have been done.

This John London had been imprisoned by the Council of Connecticut three or four years before, for reporting notorious lies; and it has been supposed by an eminent authority (Hon. James Savage, in Mass. Hist. Soc. Proceedings for Jan., 1856, p. 61,) that this affidavit was one of London's lies,—either concocted to bother the authorities who had had him imprisoned, or inspired by them after Goffe's death had removed danger, to give them the chance of showing themselves clear.

But our present knowledge that Goffe was in Hartford at the time when he is said to have been seen (May, 1679), and that the Bull family were in the secret, make any other suppositions unnecessary. There is, to be sure, a suspiciously long interval (23 days) between the date of the letter from New York and the Hartford search warrant, long enough to have secured the removal of Goffe if he were still living; and it may seem as though if consciously innocent the authorities should have moved more quickly; but perhaps some technical delay in laying the letter before the Governor and assistants, or the fact

that the charge was already a year old, and not therefore regarded important, is the explanation. Here, however, if anywhere, comes in the remote possibility of a flight to New Haven, and a gravestone marked "M. G. 80."

There is a natural disappointment that, while these materials open much of the lives of Whalley and Goffe to us, they give next to nothing about the third regicide, whose bones are unquestionably in our keeping. A single letter from James Davids (Dixwell's familiar pseudonym) to Increase Mather, is printed in the Collections (p. 164) for the first time, though referred to by Hutchinson. It relates to the transmission of his letters to England, and of letters from England to him; the date being March 22d, 1683–4. He was then living here in peace and prosperity. A doubtful tradition tells us that some two years later Sir Edmund Andros spent a Sabbath in New Haven, when he was edified by hearing Sternhold and Hopkins' version of Psalm 52d given out, beginning:

"Why dost thou, Tyrant, boast abroad,
Thy wicked works to praise,"—

and his suspicions excited by a glimpse of the venerable Dixwell, then in his 80th year; but no evil results followed.

Dixwell died in March, 1688–9, about five weeks before the news of the proclamation of William and Mary, when exile might safely have ended; but the last act in the history of the regicides in New England was already over.

NOTE.—I have thought it best to leave the passage respecting the attack on Hadley, as it was written six years ago. It should be stated, however, that a recent paper in the New England Genealogical Register, by Hon. George Sheldon, of Hadley, re-examines the grounds of the common tradition, and decides against it; the author makes no reference to the letter of Mr. Russell, on my interpretation of which I still rely.

August, 1876.

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

RETURN TO ➡ CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT
202 Main Library
642-3403

LOAN PERIOD 1 HOME USE	2	3
4	5	6

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS
1-month loans may be renewed by calling 642-3405
6-month loans may be recharged by bringing books to Circulation Desk
Renewals and recharges may be made 4 days prior to due date

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

SEP 12 1976
REC. CIR. AUG 17 '76
AUG 7 1981
Sept 7 thW81
Oct 7 th
RET'D DEC 9 1981
SENT ON ILL
MAR 29 1994
U. C. BERKELEY

JUL 09 1996

FORM NO. DD 6, 40m, 6'76
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
BERKELEY, CA 94720

1975
nia

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES
B001163935